

Appl. No. 09/870,010
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83300.0003
Customer No. 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Minor changes are made to this specification. Claims 1-4 are amended. Claims 1-4 are the independent claim. Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gase (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,996). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection herein.

The present invention is directed to a system of managing image data in a network (*See, Abstract*). The amended independent claim 1 of present invention is recited below:

“A system of managing image data in a network,
comprising: an image input device; an image forming device
including storage means for storing image data inputted by the
image input device,

at least one of the image input device and the image
forming device being connected to the network; and a client
computer, connected to the network, receives the image data
transmitted by the image forming device, for managing the
image data stored in the storage means via the network”

The amended independent claim 1 is supported in the original specification of present application. (*See, Specification; Page 7, lines 16-19*).

The applied reference does not disclose or suggest the above features of the present invention as defined by amended independent Claim 1. In particular, Gase

Appl. No. 09/870,010
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83300.0003
Customer No. 26021

does not disclose or suggest, "a client computer, connected to the network, receives the image data transmitted by the image forming device," as required by that claim.

Gase is generally directed toward a method of remotely controlling a print queue in a network printer which receives print jobs over the Internet from plural client processors. (See *Gase, Abstract*). According to Gase and Office Action, Gase teaches the image data be downloaded to the printer and eventually printed. (See, *Office Action; Page 5, lines 1-3; Gase; Col. 4, lines 60-65*).

Gase is silent regarding the image forming device transmitting the image data to the client computer as required by amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, Gase cannot be said to teach or suggest the features of that claims.

Since the applied reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above features recited in amended independent Claim 1, the reference cannot be said to anticipate or render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of that claim.

Accordingly, amended independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

With respect to amended independent claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim, reciting "receiving by the client computer the image data transmitted by the image forming device," is allowable over the applied reference for at least the same reasons as those for amended independent claim 1.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by Gase in view of Kurachi (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,436). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection herein.

The amended independent claim 2 of present invention is recited below:

Appl. No. 09/870,010
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83300.0003
Customer No. 26021

"A system of managing image data in a network,
comprising: an image input device; an image forming device
including storage means for storing image data inputted by the
image input device,

at least one of the image input device and the image
forming device being connected to the network; and a client
computer, connected to the network, for managing the image
data stored in the storage means via the network,
wherein the image forming device further includes a converter
and a network interface; the storage means comprises a binary
data storage section for storing the image data as binary data
and a text data storage section for storing text data converted
from the binary data by the converter; and the network interface
includes a software for managing the text data, and transmits
the text data stored in the text data storage section to the client
computer.

The applied references do not disclose or suggest the
above features of the present invention as defined by amended
independent Claim 1. In particular, Gase does not disclose or
suggest, "a client computer, connected to the network, receives
the image data transmitted by the image forming device," as
required by that claim."

The applied references do not disclose or suggest the above features of the
present invention as defined by amended independent Claim 2. In particular, Gase
and Kurachi do not disclose or suggest, "a binary data storage section for storing the

Appl. No. 09/870,010
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83300.0003
Customer No. 26021

image data as binary data and a text data storage section for storing text data converted from the binary data by the converter," as required by that claim.

The Office Action concedes that Gases does not teach or suggest the above features. Applicant agrees with Office regarding Gases' deficiencies.

Kurachi is generally directed toward a system of managing print data. (See *Kurachi, Abstract*). According to Kurachi, the image data file is converted to rough image data by reducing the size or quality of the images. (See *Kurachi, col. 2, lines 59-63*). Kurachi is silent regarding converting the image data to text data, as required by amended independent claim 2.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the rough image data is still image data, and is not equivalent to a text file. Accordingly, Kurachi does not teach or suggest a the converter converting the image data into text data, as required by amended independent claim 2.

With regard to the Office Action's assertion that, "printed text data is almost the same as original image' is not a claimed limitation of claim 2," as the reason for maintaining the rejection, (See, *Office Action; Page 6, lines 1-5*), Applicant respectfully submits that, "printed test data is almost the same as original image," is not a part of the arguments presented in this or the previous replies to Office Actions. Conversely, Applicant respectfully submits that Kurachi simply does not teach or suggest a text data or converting an image data to a text data, as discussed above.

Since the applied references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the above features recited in amended independent Claim 2, the references cannot be said to anticipate or render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of that claim.

Accordingly, amended independent Claim 2 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/870,010
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 30, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83300.0003
Customer No. 26021

With respect to amended independent claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim, reciting "the text data being made by converting the binary data," is allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons as those for amended independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

By: 

Lawrence J. McClure
Registration No. 44,228
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: February 15, 2006

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701